DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 607 RC 012 144

AUTHOR Just, Anne E.; Edington, Everett D.
TITLE Education of Rural Minorities in the United States and Selected Countries.
PUB DATE 7 Aug 80
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the World Congress for Rural Sociology (5th, Mexico City, August 7-11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Indians; Black Youth; Comparative Analysis; Culture Conflict; *Developed Nations; *Developing Nations; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Discrimination; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Policy; *Educational Status Comparison; Equal Education; Mexican Americans; *Minority Groups; *Rural Education; *Rural Youth
IDENTIFIERS United States

ABSTRACT

An historical problem in the education of minorities has been that those responsible for minority education have isolated the educational process from the culture of the minority being served. This factor and others (cultural bias, lack of opportunity, and background) have contributed to lower levels of educational attainment of rural minorities within both developed and developing countries. However, as a result of the urban-to-rural migration trend, the dominant urban bias in educational policy in the United States has been challenged as the focus has expanded to include rural issues. Within this enlarged scope, the needs of rural Native Americans, Mexican Americans, Black Americans, and other minorities must not be overlooked. These minority groups have historically been among the most severely disadvantaged populations in terms of good educational facilities, access to education, adequate financing, appropriate curriculum, and representative school governance structures. A comparison of other nations' experiences in rural minority educational policy formulation with that of the United States indicates many similarities, but the pervading similarity is one of suppression of the minority culture in the educational process. Governments from around the world are beginning to recognize the need for better educational programs for rural minority youth; however, this awareness has not as yet produced a proliferation of viable programs. As programs do develop, it is extremely important that adequate research becomes a part of that development. (AN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191607

EDUCATION OF RURAL MINORITIES IN THE UNITED STATES AND SELECTED COUNTRIES

By

Anne E. Just (USA)
Education Program Specialist
U.S. Department of Education
and
Second Year Doctoral Student
University of California, Berkeley

Everett D. Edington (USA)
Director
Educational Resources Information Center
Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
and
Professor of Education Management and Development
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Everett D. Edington

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Fifth World Congress for Rural Sociology, August 7-11, 1980, Mexico City.

ABSTRACT

Title: Education of Rural Minorities in the United States and Selected Countries

Authors: Dr. Everett D. Edington (USA) and Ann Just (USA)

Contact: Dr. Everett D. Edington, Director, ERIC/CRESS, Box 3AP, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003

It is easily documented that rural youth throughout the world generally have lower levels of education than either their urban or suburban counterparts. This is true in both developed and developing countries. Even to a greater disadvantage are those minority youth in rural areas. They are further behind and to a greater educational disadvantage than the majority of youth in rural areas. This paper is an analysis of the research and information available on the education of minority rural youth. It discusses the historical perspective describing patterns of descrimination as well as the present situation. It then discusses different types of programs which are attempting to overcome this disadvantage. Recommendations are made concerning possible type of research needed to strengthen the educational programs of rural minority youth as well as type of action programs which may be implemented with the knowledge presently available.

EDUCATION OF RURAL MINORITIES IN THE UNITED STATES AND SELECTED COUNTRIES

INTRODUCTION

Rural education is experiencing a renaissance in the United States as a result of the population turnaround of the 1970's. The dominant urban bias in educational policy and decision-making and its pattern of educational delivery are being challenged as the educational focus expands to include rural issues. Within this enlarged scope, the needs and concerns of minority groups in rural areas must not be overlooked. Rural, Native Americans, blacks and Mexican Americans have historically been among the most severely disadvantaged populations in terms of access to education, of educational facilities, of financing, of appropriateness of curriculum and instruction of educational attainment and of representative school governance structures.

Section I contains a description of these conditions characteristic of education for rural minority groups in the United States and of their current state of educational services.

The experiences of other nations in educational policy formulation for and delivery of services to rural minorities can assist United States policy makers and practitioners in determining effective, less effective, and ineffective approaches to serving the educational needs of these special populations.

Section II provides a review of the literature about the efforts of various countries to educate their rural minority populations. Included for contrast to and comparison with the United States are Brazil, Canada, Finland, Indonesia, Israel, Malaysia, Mexico, Norway, Russia and Sweden. Conclusions from these two sections are presented

in Section III. While the orientation of this paper is to assist United States policy makers and practitioners, it is hoped that the information presented here will also be useful to like personnel from other nations in the education of their rural minority populations.

EDUCATION OF RURAL MINORITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Anne E. Just

Rural education experienced a renaissance in the mid-1970's after an approximate 35 year hiatus. The rural-to-urban migration was initiated in the 1820's by the Industrial Revolution, enhanced at the turn of the century by corporate development, and spurred by economic recovery and defense build-up during the 1960's. Contributing to and accompanying this population shift were educational policies which sought to "urbanize" rural schools and which impressed upon rural youth that opportunities were mainly to be found in the cities. As population patterns came to embody this latter goal, the focus of educational policymaking continuously shifted to educational issues and concerns in city school districts.

This emphasis became more concerted during the mid-1950's and the 1960's as increasingly the young middle-class population moved to the suburbs, leaving the cities to older people and to low-income families from rural areas, the South, Mexico, or Puerto Rico. The War on Poverty constituted an effort to alter the poor living conditions, unemployment and inadequate educational services which had come to characterize the cities by the 1960's. The major educational component, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 with its

emphasis in Title I on providing local school districts with federal funds for compensatory programs for disadvantaged students, served as the capstone for the urban school bias which had been mounting since the 1800's. That bias still predominates today in educational policy- and decision-making.

In the mid-1970's, however, a reverse trend of urban to non-metropolitan/rural migration was noticed (Beale 1974, 1975). From 1970-1973, non-metropolitan areas experienced 4.2 percent population gain versus 2.9 percent for metropolitan/urban areas; 1970-1974 figures revealed non-metropolitan county population growth of 5.6 percent versus 3.4 percent for metropolitan counties. The most recent data from the U.S. Department of Commerce in 1978 indicates a 9.3 percent population growth in non-metropolitan areas versus 5.3 percent growth in metropolitan areas from 1970-1977 (Ross and Green, 1979). Sections of the United States experiencing population growth of 10 percent or more include non-metropolitan counties in southwestern, in western mountain, in northwest states and in Florida primarily. Counties along the west coast and on the California-Nevada border, in the Central Ozarks, in the Upper Great Lakes, in Central Texas and in Central Appalachia have also grown mainly from immigration (Ross and Green, 1979).

The current non-metropolitan immigration appears to result from economic and non-economic factors. Ample economic opportunities exist in the development of energy resources; in the decentralized expansion of manufacturing through locating plants in small communities and in rural areas; and, in the location or relocation of international and

national corporate offices in non-metropolitan areas. Concern about the quality of life has spurred retired persons, back-to-the-earth proponents concerned about the environment and individuals partial to small town or rural lifestyles to migrate from urban areas.

This population reversal has affected educational research and policy making in at least two ways. The first can be seen in the increased numbers of articles, reports and books examining and assissing the values, advantages, and problems of rural education (Sher, 1977 and 1978; Sher and Rosenfeld, 1977; Fratoe, 1978; Parks and Sher, 1979; Ross and Green, 1979; Gjelten, 1978. Second, responsive action has occurred. At the federal level, the U.S. Office of Education, the National Institute of Education and the U.S. Department of Agriculture sponsored a Rural Education Seminar in May 1979 and regional round tables in August and September 1979 to develop recommendations for new guidelines and policies or for modifiying existing ones regarding the delivery of educational services to rural children and adults (Jacobsmeyer, 1980). The U.S. Congress in creating the new U.S. Department of Education included in the new agency a specific unit to address the issues and problems of rural education. Thus, the neglect of rural schools characteristic of the urban-oriented twentith century, may have been halted temporarily.

The increased emphasis on rural educaiton seems to parallel the focus on minority education which followed the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision barring racially segregated educational facilities; the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 containing the implementation strategy for that court decision; and, the passage of ESEA with its emphasis on

educationally disadvantaged students. Yet, these two emphases have not merged. Information about minority education has concentrated primarily on issues pertinent to urban populations. Materials on rural education have had a generic focus for the most part; only a small amount of work has been done on the issues of educational delivery to women and minority groups in rural areas (Dunne, 1979; Fratoe, 1978 and Forthcoming; Chavis, 1979; Jones, 1980). Thus, a challenge is presented when attempting to discuss the education of rural minority youth in the United States. Yet, such is the purpose of this first section.

The minority groups selected for this section include Native Americans, blacks, and Mexican Americans. There are several reasons for these choices. First, these groups have been in the United States longer than other racial or ethnic groups which have subsequently immigrated, E.G. French Canadians, Western and Eastern Europeans, and Asians. Second, these groups have not readily been accepted by the dominant culture and thus have experienced continuous discrimination including exclusion from, minimal participation in, and inferior service from elementary and secondary education institutions. Third, large proportions of these minority groups still live in rural areas of the United States. Therefore, this section contains two parts. The first will briefly describe general characteristics of rural areas and of rural education in the United States today in order to enlarge the contextual framework of this section. The second part will trace the historical patterns of educating the selected groups of minority students, including current efforts to enhance their educational opportunities in rural areas where many such students still receive their education.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RURAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

Each of the 50 states has a rural constituency. Eighteen states, according to the 1970 census, had a rural population of at least 40 percent; 26 states had at least 30 percent. Between one-fourth and one-third of the public school pupils are enrolled in non-metropolitan/rural* schools; close to one-fifth of these pupils live in rural areas. Over 11,000 school districts, about two-thirds of the total of 16,000 districts nationwide, are located in non-metropolitan areas. In 1977, 8,761 school districts had student populations under 1000 versus 7,351 with populations over 1,000 (Parks, 1979; Bass and Berman, 1979).

In terms of socioeconomic and educational factors, many rural communities are severely disadvantaged, even compared to inner cities. Rural areas experience the country's highest rates of poverty, infant mortality, malnutrition, under employment and substandard housing (Sher, 1978). With regard to education, the following characteristics of non-metropolitan/rural residents when compared to metropolitan/urban populations are not uncommon: attending public schools lacking support services and personnel and spending less on institution; enrolling later in school and leaving earlier, progressing more slowly through school; completing fewer years of schooling; not planning for vocational

*"Rural" defines open countryside and places of less than 2,500 population, not located near metropolitan areas.

"Nonmetropolitan" refers to a location with less than 50,000 residents, including those living nearby. (U.S. Census Bureau definitions)

training nor enrolling in adult education programs; scoring lower on national assessment tests; and, becoming functional illiterates (Fratoe, 1978; Sher, 1978). These problems generally are intensified when focusing on Native Americans, blacks and Mexican-Americans in rural areas.

EDUCATION OF NATIVE AMERICANS.

Native Americans*, the aboriginal peoples of the United States or "Indians" including Eskimos and Aleuts, number 835,000 according to the 1970 census, an increase of almost 50 percent from the 1960 census count (Fuchs and Havighurst, 1972). Although every state and the District of Columbia have Native American residents, the following states have more than 50 percent, or close to 452,000, of all Native Americans counted in the 1970 census: Oklahoma, Arizona, California, New Mexico, Alaska and North Carolina. Other states and regions of the country with sizeable Native American populations included: North and South Dakota with 47,000; Washington State and Oregon with 47,000; the mountain states of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah and Wyoming with 67,000; the northern parts of Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin with 59,000; New York with 28,000; and, Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska with 18,000. Maine, Mississippi and Florida have organized Native American communites and tribes of some size (Fuchs and Havighurst, 1972). During the 1960s, Native Americans migrated to cities and urban areas seeking employment and better working conditions. Estimates of Native American urban dwellers range from 250,000 (if only cities of 50,000 or more population are counted)

*The terms "Native American" and "Indian" will be used all inclusively in this paper.

to 280,000 (if places of 2,500 or more are included.) Nevertheless, the greater part of the Native American population continues to live in non-metropolitan/rural areas of the United States and the history of their educational problems follows.

The history of Native American education has been divided into several distinct periods each with its particular approach to educating Native Americans (Indian Education: A National Tragedy-A National Challenge, 1969; Fuchs and Havighurst, 1972; Weinberg, 1977) with the contemporary one yet unfolding. These divisions include the following: the mission period; the treaty period; the allotment period; the "Indian New Deal" period; the termination period; the 1960s; and, now, the self-determination period. With the exception of the mission period, the education of Native Americans has been linked inextricably to policies and practices of the federal government.

Educational activities in the mission period, which began with the Jesuit mission school for Florida Indians in 1568, sought to change Native Americans more than to educate them. The Franciscans and Protestants who joined the Jesuits in the new world all had as their goal to reshape Native Americans in the mold of white men, thus to civilize and to christianize the aboriginal peoples. Education was viewed as the best way to accomplish this goal. The church domination of Indian education lasted for 300 years and established the philosophy of Native American education in the United States.

In 1778, with the signing of the treaty between the United States and the Delaware Tribe, treaties became established ..."as the primary legal basis for Federal policies in regard to American Indians"

(Indian Education..., P.11). The signing of the first treaty in 1794 which specified that the federal government would provide a tribe with teachers established a practice which continued for the next 80 years. While the government's goal paralleled that of the missionaries-to civilize Native Americans, the motivation stemmed from the government's desire to obtain Indian lands. The conversion of Native Americans from hunters to farmers would require less land for these people and would facilitate their containment; additional land would then be available for white settlement. Education was viewed as the means for attaining such conversion.

In exchange for the nearly one billion acres which Native Americans ceded to the United States between 1778 and 1871, when the government ceased treaty making, Indians retained inalienable and tax-exempt lands as well as obtaining government pledges to provide public services such as education, technical and agricultural training and medical care. Congress first appropriated such funds in 1802; legislation passed in 1819 to provide for an annual "civilization fund" formed the basis for most Indian education programs until 1873. In 1832, Congress created the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs and charged that individual with the responsibility for the education of Native Americans. Early Commissioners viewed their Indian charges as barbarous heathens and thus formulated their educational policies to control Indians through coercive assimilation (Indian Education..., 1969).. In order to civilize Native Americans, an extensive program of manual training in agriculture and mechanic arts was established. As of 1838, 16 government-operated manual schools and 87 boarding schools served 800 and 2,900 students respectively.

The Dawes Severalty Act of 1887 ushered in the allotment period of Native American education which lasted until 1928. This legislation allowed for land allotments to individual indians as a way to shatter tribal structure and to offer Indians an opportunity for a more civilized life. The land policy implemented the government's Indian education policy.

> "...Proceeds from the destruction of the Indian land base were to be used to pay the costs of taking Indian children from their homes and placing them in Federal boarding schools-a system designed to dissolve the Indian social structure... They (the boarding schools) were designed to separate a child from his reservation and family, strip him of his tribal lore and mores, force the complete abandonment of his native language, and prepare him for never again returning to his people. (Indian Education ..., P.12)"

The overall purposes of these policies were to relieve the government of the enormous burden of supporting Indian social services to "settle the Indian question" within the next generation (Fuchs and Havighurst, 1972).

To these ends, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) mandated compulsory school attendance in programs emphasizing citizenship education, literacy training and vocational/industrial instruction Boarding Schools were built in the 1870s to provide such training. In the 1890s, to supplement its efforts the BIA encouraged the attendance of Native Americans in public schools. Congress enacted legislation to reimburse public school districts for the additional expense incurred in educating Indian children. The law had the following two purposes; to provide legislative authority to the policy of integrating Native Americans into the dominant culture, thereby establishing assimilation as the goal and public schools as an inducement for educating Native American Students (Indian Education ..., 1969).

Yet, despite these efforts, very little schooling was available to Native Americans because of either the shortage of BIA schools or the reluctance of public schools to educate these students. By the 1920s large numbers of Indians had never attended school. During this period, also, Indian schools were very poorly financed, constrained by legislative limits on the per capita cost in boarding schools, subsequently repealed in 1929. In 1918, the federal government disengaged itself from jurisdiction over and support of numerous Indian children with enactment of legislation preventing appropriation of funds to educate children of less than one-fourth Indian blood, whose parents were citizens of the United Sates and of States where adequate public schools existed. Goals of the allotment period were partially realized.

Published in 1928, the Meriam Report (directed by Lewis Meriam of the University of Chicago) surveyed the social and economic conditions of Native Americans. Its major findings stressed that Indians were excluded from the management of their own affairs and were receiving services, particularly health and education, of poor quality. Reflecting the previously progressive educational philosophies of the day, the report strongly critized the existing educational philosophy and practices of the BIA boarding schools and stressed the need for relevant instructional curricula geared to individual needs and backgrounds of the students. In addition, the report addressed the needs of furnishing adequate secondary education as well as loan and scholarship programs for higher education; of providing educational specialists instead of BIA administrators to direct educational programs; of obtaining highly qualified teachers for Indian schools; of offering a model of educational excellance

via the federal school system; and, of strengthening, not destroying, the Indian family and social structure. (Fuchs and Havighurst, 1972; Indian Education..., 1969). The traditional curricula of public schools also came under criticism as inappropriate to the education of Native Americans.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs entering the Roosevelt administration in 1933 took action. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 ended the allotment period and paved the way for increasing the autonomy of tribal government. In education, the BIA began programs in bilingual education; in adult basic education; in Indian culture; in the training of Indian teachers; and, in in-service teacher training. By 1945, 16 boarding schools were closed and 84 day schools opened. The 75 percent of Indian students enrolled in boarding schools in 1933 had shifted to two-thirds attending day schools ten years later.

Yet, despite these improvements, Fuchs and Havighurst contend that the Meriam report did not depart from the assimilation goal but rather stressed humanitarian values and increased federal spending as the most efficient way to close out the federal government's relationship with Native Americans. The Johnson-O'Malley Act (JOM) passed in 1934, and amended in 1936, reflects this orientation. JOM funds are to be contracted with states for the education, medical attention, agricultural assistance and social welfare of Native Americans in the state. The use of these funds largely for educational purposes has implemented the BIA's policy of gradually relinquishing its education responsibilities to the public schools. JOM constitutes one of the primary means of federally subsidizing

Indian education. However, in practice, school districts have traditionally used JOM monies to supplement their operating budgets, thereby benefiting all students, despite the explicit purpose of JOM funds to provide for the needs of Indian students only.

Following World War II, retrenchment of the federal government's position on "Indian New Deal" programs occurred and a return to pre-Meriam policies was urged. The Indian Affairs Committee in the House and the Senate critized the tendency of the BIA day schools to adapt education to Indians and their ways of life "....rather than to adapt the Indians to the habits and requirements needed... by an independent citizen earning his own way off the reservation" (Fuchs and Havinghurst, p.13). Through the 1950's concerted efforts abounded to end federal commitments to Indian tribes, a policy known as termination, as the federal policy of coercive assimilation was revived. The BIA closed all the schools in Idaho, Michigan, Wisconsin and Washington in 1952; numerous boarding schools and day schools were closed a year later with Indian students transferred to public schools. The federal boarding schools remaining open re-adopted the forced assimilation policy by educating Native American children far far away from home so that they would forget their families and native lifestyles. Termination was partially halted in 1958 when the Secretary of the Interior (the department which oversees the BIA) stated that no Indian tribe would be terminated without its consent.

Native Americans repudiated the termination policies of the 1950's and began to express their desire to participate actively in planning

and implementing programs on their behalf. Two reports in the early 1960's reaffirmed the Indian positions and suggested the basis of new federal Indian policies be economic development on Indian reservations. Thus between 1961 and 1965, the BIA altered its policy orientation and initiated a program of economic and community development. Two legislative developments in the mid-1960's assisted Native Americans in realizing their goals with regard to education. The Economic Opportunity Act with Head Start (early childhood experiences), Upward Bound (preparing high school students for post-secondary training), Job Corps (training and retraining of unemployed and underemployed workers), and VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), provided Indians with opportunities to participate in and to control programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), despite its strongly urban bias, made funds available to improve the education of Indians in federal schools when the law was amended in 1966. Under the provision known as Title I, disadvantaged Indian students in public schools benefit from compensatory education programs offered on their behalf. The Parent Advisory Committees required under Title I have empowered Indian parents to participate in and have some control over the education of their children. Other parts of this legislation have made drop-out prevention, bilingual, career education programs available to Native American pupils in public schools. The 1960's closed with President Johnson's rejecting the termination policy of the 1950's and encouraging the adoption of the policy of Indian self determination.

In the spirit of Indian self determination, the 1970's have seen passage of two important pieces of legislation. The first was the Indian

Education Act of 1972, geared to the needs of all Indian school children. This legislation set a precedent for Indian control" (Szasz, 1974). Parental and community participation was mandated in the creation and control of certain local school district programs. Provisions encouraged the establishment of community-run schools. Funds were provided for training teachers for Indian Bureau schools.

A series of grant programs was authorized to stress culturally relevant and bilingual curriculum materials, with Indian controlled agencies and institutions to receive preference in funding. An Office of Indian Education was created within the U.S. Office of Education to be directed by a Deputy Commissioner for Indian Education charged to administer the provisions of the Act. The Presidentially-appointed, all Indian National Advisory Council on Indian Education, provides advice on all matters pertaining to Indian Education and reviews all grant applications. The legislation was enacted largely in response to demands of Indians in urban areas and of Indians served by public schools who, once they left their reservations, the BIA felt no further responsibility for the education of such children. Secondly, the Indian self-determination and Educational Assistance Act of 1975 strengthened the ability of Indian tribes to receive federal funds on contract with the BIA for the provision of social services. The second part of the act placed increased responsibility in the hands of Native Americans regarding the use of JOM funds in local school districts.

The results of this chequered legacy on the education of Native Americans are dismal. Almost every aspect of BIA schooling is characterized

by low quality school facilities, instructional materials, accessibility of school building, teachers and administrators attitudes. The academic performance of Indian students in federal schools is seriously lacking. For example, 40 percent of the students drop out before graduation, twice the national average; the average educational level is five school years; more than one out of five Indian men have less than five years of schooling; graduates on the average are more than two years below national norms on achievement tests; only 28 percent go on to college compared to the national average of 50 percent; only 25 percent of those enrolling in college graduate (Indian Education...1969).

In the public schools, Native Americans also encounter difficulties. Until the 1970's, Indian parents have had little, if any, influence in or control of the education of their children attending public schools. Public schools curriculum, until recently, rarely included coursework about Indian history, cultural and language. Impetus from federal legislation has increased Indian bilingual and bi-cultural materials in public schools during the 1970's. Yet, prevalent attitudes of school administrators and teachers regarding the inferiority and the expected school and life failures of Indian students appear to have changed little.

EDUCATION OF BLACK AMERICANS*

The 1970 census reported approximately 22 million blacks in the United States, with 74 percent living in metropolitan areas and with 5.7 million or 25.9 percent living in non-metropolitan areas. In 1977, the black population had grown to almost 24.5 million with close to 6.5 million blacks or 26.3 percent living in rural/non-metropolitan

* The statistical information in this section is derived from data contained in "The Educational Status of Non-Metro Blacks" a forthcoming paper by Frank A. Fratoe of the Economic Development Division, Economics, Statistics and Cooperative Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

areas. About 90 percent of these non-metropolitan blacks reside in southern states* in contrast to metropolitan blacks who live in urban areas throughout the four geographic regions of the United States. Prior to World War I, however, the situation of metropolitan and non-metropolitan blacks was virtually reversed as approximately 75 percent of the total black population lived in rural areas, again almost completely in the South. After 1910, blacks in large numbers began to migrate to southern urbanized, industrial areas or to northern cities to improve their economic status as the economy of the rural south faltered. This population shift, particularly to northern cities, became more pronounced with the Great Depression, World War II and the Korean War as blacks sought to escape restraints on their economic, social and political opportunities and to avail themselves of greater advantages in urban areas. Thus, between 1910 and 1960 the black population in the North increased greatly so that by 1960, 4 out of 10 blacks lived in the North versus 1 out of 10 in 1910 (Ogbu, 1978).

The history of black education in the United States, like that of Native Americans, can be viewed in distinct periods with differing patterns from the South to the North (Ogbu, 1978; Weinberg, 1977); yet, with observable similarities in philosophy and practice. But, since this paper focuses on rural minorities, the historical review presented will concentrate on black education in the South as that geographic region has the largest black rural population.

* Southern states are defined by U.S. Bureau of Census as Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia.

Prior to the Civil War (1861-1865) blacks were virtually deprived of public educational opportunities in the South. The prevailing educational policy for southern slave children, according to Weinberg, was "compulsory ignorance,... the primary instrument of enslavement" (Weinberg, P. 11). Ogbu (1978) cites three reasons for this exclusion of black children from the formal educational process.

> "First, most white people believed that blacks were inferior to whites in intelligence and were therefore not as capable of benefiting from formal education...Second, it was argued that formal education would make blacks less useful as workers. Third, it was widely believed that formal education of blacks was a threat to the social order because it would encourage discontent and rebellion. (Ogbu, P.105)

Although most slaves were not allowed to enroll in public schools, some received education through various means. Among these were secret schools; technical training for slave artisans and record-keepers on the plantations; Sunday schools to teach slaves to read the Bible (a practice thought by slave owners and churchmen to render slaves obedient and loyal); and, individual plantation owners' provision of education to both their own children and to slave children.

Free blacks, over half of whom lived in the South between 1800 and 1860, did not come under direct authority of plantation owners. Their educational opportunities were regulated by law and provided usually through non-public school channels such as secret schools, private missionary schools, Sabbath schools, and apprenticeship programs. Despite their "freedom," free blacks experienced both a similar lack of access to public educational opportunities as slaves and a like toll from compulsory ignorance laws as the percentage of black adults with the "rudiments of education" dropped precipitously between 1825 and 1860.

(Weinberg, P.20). Ogbu, who contends that the lower school performance of blacks lies in the main with the American caste system or system of social stratification (p.3), describes southern black education of this period as follows:

> "Black education was largely determined by what the dominant white caste perceived as required by the blacks' inferior position in the social order. It was not an education intended to prepare blacks for the same social and occupational positions open to whites in adult life. It merely prepared blacks for thier inferior positions in life."(Ogbu, P. 106)

Following the Civil War, southern blacks demanded schooling. Initially, their demands were met in the South as the Freeman's Bureau and northern missionaries worked together to develop a school system to educate blacks throughout the South. The passage of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which guarantees blacks full privileges of citizenship, allowed the new political coalition in state legislatures (white northerns, native white southerners who supported the Republican party, and newly enfranchised blacks) to create public school systems for whites and blacks. The educational training provided blacks recreated the instructional emphases and techniques of New England, thereby extending beyond the moral and religious instruction frequently characteristic of the limited black education before the Civil War. "The general orientation of black education turned toward enabling blacks to attain equal status with whites in the social, economic, and political realms." (Ogbu, P. 108).

By 1877, however, control of southern state legislatures had largely returned from the "reconstructionist" coalitions to conservative white leaders, who, Ogbu argues, sought to re-establish blacks as the pariah

caste. In education, this effort resulted in two changes in black education. "One was a redifinition of what type of education was appropriate for blacks, and the other was the termination of equal funding and related services for black area white schools." (Ogbu, P.110). The reconstructionists' emphasis on academic education for blacks was replaced with manual or industrial training. Public funds were diverted from black education to support the education of white children; less well-trained and paid teachers were hired for black schools; the school year was frequently shorter for blacks; facilities and equipment in black schools were lacking or were inferior to those of white schools as southern states found it difficult to support two separate public school systems. In 1896, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the doctrine of "separate but equal" provision of public services and facilities according to race, thus establishing as policy a doctrine which and been practiced vigorously in education.

This pattern for black education in the South had been established. "From 1900 on, Negro schools fell farther behind white schools; by 1915, the gap was larger; it reached its greatest extent by 1930. The black-white per student expenditure gap, 50 percent in the seaboard South in 1905, had grown to 300 percent by 1915." (Weinberg, P.57). Between 1901 and 1915, over 95 percent of the white students in the South had educational services available to them; barely 50 percent of the black students had the same opportunity. Emphasis remained on industrial training and on manual education in both rural and urban schools, particularly as northern patrons and philanthropists became involved in southern black education

to counterbalance the active white supremacy movement. "By the 1930s, racial discrimination in Southern public education had reached its greatest extent" (Weinberg, P.63).

Although this educational delivery pattern remained virtually intact until mid-twentieth century, the effects of a faltering agricultural economy, two world wars and the Great Depression brought about social and economic changes which had an impact on education of southern blacks. Ogbu argues that as industrial development required more industrially trained workers and as this type of education spread throughout the country with federal and state funding, the participation of blacks in industrial education became more restricted. Instead, black schools in the South began to stress academic education; white schools, industrial training. "The reversal of the policy of emphasizing industrial education for blacks in this period points to the fact that education for blacks, industrial or academic, was not seriously intended to elevate blacks above their current status" (Ogbu, P. 117).

Secondly, and of particular interest here, blacks had begun leaving southern rural areas for southern and northern cities after the Civil War and had over the period of 1880 to 1920 more than doubled their population in southern cities. In the 1920s, for the first time, the majority of black school-age children did not live on farms; by the 1930s, the center of black educational problems, if defined by numbers, shifted from the rural to the urban south (Weinberg, 1977). Southern urban schools were superior to those in the rural areas as a stronger financial base existed to support education. Nevertheless, blacks remained segregated and were provided education different from that of white students. The population shift was accompanied by a shift in

educctional emphasis thus exacerbating the lesser aspects of educational delivery to blacks which remained characteristic of the rural schools.

Efforts to improve and to desegregate black education culminated in the 1954 Supreme Court ruling in Brown V. the Board of Education of Topeka which held that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal and deprive individuals so treated of equal protection of the laws as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Southern school districts largely ignored this policy directive to integrate their schools and to provide like educational opportunities to the black and white students. In the few desegregated schools, ability grouping and tracking programs were begun or expanded. Expenditures for building black schools increased sharply but remained well behind like expenditures for white schools. "In many southern states, material in equality continued under segregation or token desegregation, while states spent tax moneys to fight desegregation or to finance private white segregation schools." (Weinberg, P.97)

In 1964, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, provided the strategy necessary to implement the Brown decision. Federal educational funds can be withheld from educational institutions which discriminate against students on the basis of race, religion, or national origin. The considerable federal funds which became available with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 prompted response at both the local and state levels to correct the condition of southern black education. Compensatory education programs, though sought primarily by large northern urban school districts to assist in educating their minority students, also assisted southern rural school districts which

remain predominantly black. Yet, the double blow to rural southern schools of serving primarily black students and of the shift of interest to southern urban areas had taken its toll. Thus, Fratoe can still report in 1980 that non-metropolitan blacks remain lower than metropolitan blacks and whites on several measures of educational attainment and enrollment, despite absolute gains during the 1970s. These measures include high school completion; college enrollment and completion; adult education participation; pre-primary school enrollment; and, functional literacy. As a result, non-metropolitan blacks are less likely to be in the labor force, to hold white-collar occupations, and to receive incomes over poverty levels (Fratoe, forthcoming).

THE EDUCATION OF MEXICAN AMERICANS

Mexican-Americans or Chicanos are distinct from Puerto Ricans and from citizens of Spanish or South American ancestry. They retain much of their Mexican ancestrial culture and continue to occupy low socio-economic positions in U.S. society despite the fact that their roots in the Southwest go back to the sixteenth or seventeenth century. The 1970 census reports total Hispanic (all Spanish-surnamed or Spanish-speaking people) in the United States as almost 9.1 million. Of that total 85 percent are Mexican-Americans whose population is concentrated in five southwestern states - Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico and Texas. The Great Depression and the organization and industrialization of the Southwest since World War I have caused most hicanos to move to metropolitan areas. Mexican-Americans do populate nonmetropolitan areas, either as permanent residents or as migrant workers. While much recent literature has focused on educational issues of Mexican Americans,

little specific information is currently available about educating rural Chicanos. Yet, a brief review of the history of Mexican American education can provide an understanding of the problems they have faced in receiving educational services in the United States.

Education of original settlers in the Southwest areas of the United States prior to acquisition was extremely wide-ranged and varied. Spanish rule in Mexico from 1519 to 1821 suppressed the centuries' old Indian formal educational systems. What there was of popular education was instead private, Catholic and Spanish (Weinberg, 1977). California missions educated Indians in Spanish to the exclusion of their native languages taught them skilled crafts. Later in the 1820s and '30s, the missions educated Indians, metizo and white children together. The practice stopped when white U.S. citizens emigrated to California in the mid 1840s and set up exclusive voluntary schools for their children.

After the 1846-1848 military conquest of Mexico, the United States guaranteed the rights of citizenship to Mexicans choosing to stay in the new American territories (Weinberg, 1977). However, white leaders saw no urgency in creating public schools for the Spanish-speaking majority. For example, the first New Mexico public school was organized in 1871; the first full-scale school law was enacted in 1891 (Weinberg, 1977). Texas, under pressure from blacks, was forced to create a statewide school system during Reconstruction. Impediments to Chicano enrollment were common, including extremely low state appropriations which prevented small, poor, Chicano settlements from having a school; designation of English as the only language of instruction; and, segregation of Mexican-American children into separate inferior public schools.

The turn of the century reflected the dominant society's prevailing of Mexican Americans as "outsiders who were never expected to participate fully in American life.(Carter & Segura, pg.15). In fact, Carter and Segura go on to contend that

> "By expecting minority children to fail in school and society and doing nothing to aid them, society produced the human types needed. The dominant society insured the perpetuation of the two-class (or dual-caste) social system engendured by ranching, railroading, and mining-the economic basis of the Southwest of that period. The predominantly rural Southwest educated the dominant groups children to assume their natural role as leaders, managers, and owners, and schooled Mexican-Americans to assume their natural role as farm and ranch workers....Too much education for the docile workers might destroy the delicate social equilibrium necessary to maintain these economic system."(Carter & Segura, p.15-16)

A strong parallel with the education of rural southern blacks can be seen. Thus, the dominant philosophy and practices of educating Mexican Americans were established.

A slight shift during the 1930s and 1940s when the Great Depression and World War II caused Mexican Americans to move to urban areas. City schools assumed their function of Americanizing Mexican-American students as they had done with the European immigrants since the 1830s. The schools stressed vocational training; english language instruction; health education; and, core American values. Some states established particular instructional programs for Mexican Americans; teachers' conferences, after World War II began to focus on the educational problems of Chicano students and of their students. Nevertheless, this new attention to Mexican Americans did not change prevailing practices in many Southwestern School districts of segregating these students from white pupils; of diverting state funds from them to white schools; of providing inferior

school facilities and poorly qualified teachers, larger classes than white schools and curricula not responsive to their language and cultural needs; of failing to enforce attendance laws while counting Chicano students on the school role; and, of discouraging many Chicano students from attending school, particularly for secondary training.

World War II spurred Mexican-Americans as they became aware of their rights to demand changes in their social, economic, political and educational situations. In education, Chicanos sought to end school segregation, which was technically legal in all Southwestern states. However, the practice had gained the force of law, thus requiring legal action to curtail it. In 1946, Chicano parents won a law suit (Mendez v. Westminster School District) claiming that four California school districts by maintaining separate facilities, discriminated illegally against Mexican American pupils. A federal court in the 1948 Delgado v. Bastrop Independent School District suit, ruled that school segregation of Chicanos in Texas was illegal. Thus, these and like cases established that the de jure segregation of Mexican-American pupils was against the law.

Yet, it was not until the 1960's that both the Southwestern states and the rest of the country became aware of the plight of Mexican-Americans. Chicano school enrollment and academic achievement was considerably lower than for other groups of students; the drop out rate was astonishingly high. Chicanos experienced high rates of unemployment and of underemployment and were exceedingly over represented in low-skill occupations. Poor housing conditions and low political participation completed the picture Mexican-American poverty.

As with blacks, the schools in 1965 thru ESEA were charged with playing a major role for Chicanos in the War on Poverty waged by President Johnson. The legislation focused on instititional change; on equal education opportunity; on community participation; and, on the needs and problems of disadvantaged and non english speaking-children. Between 1965 and 1975, unequal facilities for Chicano students received attention; numerous programs were developed to overcome deficiencies of the Chicano pupil. Bilingual-cross cultural education education programs have increased, especially since the mid-1970s. The segregation of Mexican American students was further challenged in two court cases, Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Independent School District (1970) and Kyes v. School District Number One in Denver (1973). These suits established that Chicanos were an identifiable minority; had suffered from prejudice and discrimination; and, constituted a social subordinate population. Since Chicanos are not legally white and cannot alone be integrated with black students, school districts so combining these students were determined to be segregated. Despite these efforts and the elimination of flagrant differences on the whole, "...subtle but persuasive inadequacies....defacto segregation and ethnic isolation continue. Schools are ethnically and racially out of balance in metropolitan areas as well as in small urban and rural areas." (Carter & Segura, p.23; p.134).

This pattern of schooling Mexican-American pupils has resulted in severe consequences for such students. A 1972 survey by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reveals that Mexican American reading

achievement; extra curricula activity and student retention rates by schools were substantially less than for white students. "In general, compared with the total adult American population, nearly six times more Mexican-Americans completed fewer than five years of elementary school...and less than half as many Mexican-Americans completed four years of high school or more." (Weinberg, p. 151) Until 1950, the drop out rate for Chicano high school students was close 100 percent. Although this rate has dropped since then, it still exceeds that of the white student population.

CONCLUSIONS

Varying philosophies underlie the education of Native Americans, blacks and Mexican Americans in the United States. In terms of Native Americans, coercive assimilation has primarily characterized their educational opportunities. For blacks, exclusion from education was followed by limited access to training which did not prepare these students to compete with the dominant society for employment upon completion of schooling. Chicanos in rural areas experience educational deprivation similar to blacks; in urban areas, Americanization.

The outcome of historic similarities are apparant in the delivery of educational services to these minority groups particularly in rural areas, and in the results of these schooling practices. Access to education has been restricted and usually segregated. School facilities were either lacking or were considerably inferior to those of white students. Financing of public education was characterized by lower per pupil expenditures for minority students than for white students.

Curricula frequently did not take into consideration the cultural heritage or language of minority pupils. School membership, and administrative and teaching staffs usually did not represent the demographics of the school community. Minority students compared unfavorably in terms of national achievement tests; school years completed; literacy; participation in extra-curricula activities; and, school retention rates. While recent efforts since the mid-1960s have lessened the gap between white and minority students on these measures much of the minority gain has been by those in urban areas. The urban school bias long prevelant in educational-policy making has left rural minority students lagging behind their urban counterparts.

REFERENCES

Beale, Calvin L.; "Rural Development: Population and Settlement Prospects." Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, 27 (Jan-Feb 1974).

Carter, Thomas P. and Segura, Roberto D.; Mexican School: A History of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Carter, Thomas P. and Segura, Roberto D.; Mexican Americans in School: A Decade of Change. New York: College of Entrance Examination Board, 1979.

Chavis, Kanawha Z.; "Sending Children to School in Holmes County, Mississippi." PTA Today (Dec 1979/Jan 1980).

Dunne, Faith; "Today's Rural Women: More than Fresh Pie on the Windowsill." PTA Today (Dec 1979/Jan 1980)

Fratoe, Frank; Rural Education and Rural Labor Force in the Seventies. Rural Development Research Report 5. Washington D.C.: USDA Economics Statistics, and Cooperative Service, 1978.

Fratoe, Frank; The Educational Status of Nonmetro Blacks, forthcoming.

Gjelsen, Tom; Schooling in Isolated Communities, Portland, Me: North Haven Project, 1978.

Fuchs, Essille and Havighurst, Robert J; To Live on This Earth. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972.

Martin, Wayne H; "Student Achievement in Rural Schools: A View From the National Assessment Data," a paper prepared for the Rural Education Seminar, May 29-31, 1979.

Jacobsmeyer, Donald J; Rural Education Initiative: A Report on the Regional Rural Roundtables. Kansas City DHEW, Office of Educational Programs, Region VII, 1980.

Jones, Myron; "Indian Education and the Frontiers of Federal Advocacy," a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1980.

Ogbu, John U.; Minority Education and Caste. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Parks, Gail A.; "Rural Minority Education and the Rural Education Movement: Where Do They Stand?," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1980.

Parks, Gail A. and Sher, Jonathan P.; Imaginary Gardens? Real Problems. Las Cruces: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, New Mexico State University, 1979.

Ross, Peggy J. and Green, Bernal L.; Impacts of the Rural Turnaround on Rural Education. Las Cruces: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, New Mexico State University, 1979.

Sher, Jonathan P. and Rosenfeld, Stuart A.; Public Education in Sparsely Populated Areas of the United States. Washington, D.C.: National Rural Center and the National Institute of Education, HEW, 1977.

Sher, Jonathan P., ed.; Education in Rural America: A Reassessment of Conventional Wisdom. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1977.

Sher, Jonathan P.; Revitalizing Rural Education: A Legislator's Handbook. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of State Legislatures, 1978.

Special Subcommittee on Indian Education. Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge, 1969 Report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Szasz, Margaret. Education and the American Indian. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.

Weinberg, Meyer; A Chance to Learn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

USDA Economic Research Service; The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America. Washington, D.C., 1975.

EDUCATION OF RURAL MINORITIES IN SELECTED OTHER NATIONS

Everett D. Edington

It is impractical to discuss the education of a people without looking at their total social, economic, and cultural development. One of the historical problems in the education of minorities has been that those people who were responsible for education have tried to isolate it from the culture of the people concerned.

Educational policies for a people often correlate with socioeconomic and development policies set by the majority government. McNeil (1978) reports that Brazil's Indian policies have been internal -- to extract minerals, power, timber and agricultural products without due regard for the rights of tribal groups in the Amazon. Policies on exploitation of natural resources then permeated educational policies for the Amazon tribes.

It is often true that the majority see little advantage in educating the rural minority. In fact, the more educated the rural minority becomes, the more unlikely it is that they can be economically exploited. This can be related to similar situations with American Indians in the United States, where oil, coal, petroleum, and uranium have been discovered on Indian lands. As the Indians have become more educated, they have also become more aware of and interested in the advantages of policy developments that protect their rights.

This lack of concern for minority rights is not true in all cases, however. Danilov (1972) reported that the minor nationalities in northern Russia have developed adequate education programs and that minor nationalism is flourishing. As a result, the people have been educated and are thus progressing in their society.

Most national policies stress the importance of better education, especially of younger children. But most of the policies fail to take into account the culture of the people, which may directly contradict the type of education the national government wishes to develop for the native villages (Whitman 1976). The attitude of the majority toward the rural minority is one cause of ineffective educational policy. Whitman reports that even the kindliest of whites sometimes seem to look upon the Indian as a child who is perpetually held in a developmental stage -- lower than that of a full adult human being. Others regard him as a brute, little better than an animal capable only of carrying a heavy load. Trueba (1976) reports that rural schools in the state of Puebla, Mexico, have a long history of intervention by civil and religious authorities who are concerned with the education of the Indian. The indications are the same here--that the policy was more concerned with the interests of the outside group than of the native minority. In many places, national policies are even aimed at cultural destruction, with assimilation of the minorities to a lower-class, serf-like existence (Whitman, 1976).

Not only do we often find that rural people are isolated, but also that rural minorities are even more isolated (geographically, and culturally). But while these people may be a minority in the general population, their isolated groups may form small majorities. Swift (1975) found that in the Northland's schools which predominantly serve native children in Alberta province, Canada, 32 are almost entirely white, 2 or 3 schools enroll both white and native children, and the remainder are native. Again, he emphasized that there is danger in assuming that all schools in a community, including native schools, are alike. He found that, at present, most of these people have minimal contact with

the rest of Alberta. The accessibility of roads, on the other hand, has increased external contact, with people outside the community and also with people in the community going out for a variety of reasons. Treaty Indians in Canada and other places on reservations have a "built-in" isolation that white society does not easily penetrate. Intercourse and mutual involvement of the two communities will, however, continue to increase, opening new vistas to people whose isolation is thereby reduced considerably. Trueba (1974) briefly described a situation on Sierra Madre's western slope in Zacapoaxtla, Mexico, where groups of American Indians cluster, isolate themselves from the rest of the world, and maintain their culture and traditions in so far as the national, economic, and political organizations permit. The same situation exists with Indian groups in the moist tropics of South America; however, many of these native groups are rapidly disappearing. Isolation, whether it is geographic or by decision of the minority group itself, often makes it difficult to provide adequate educational programs. In all fairness to the governments involved, it should be noted that quite often the rural minorities resist the educational policies designed to improve their status. This resistance is often due to a lack of involvement by the people themselves concerned as well as lack of perceived relevancy.

EFFECTS OF CULTURE

Policy making bodies at the national and provincial levels often fail to take into account the cultural differences in rural minority groups. Apazo (1978) reported that, in Bolivia, as in a great many other

countries, the educational system seemed to ignore the basic Indian culture and tried to brainwash them into subservience to the European culture. This same situation exists throughout the world. We find that majority ethnic groups often attempt to instill their culture into rural minority groups through the avenues of education. Rural school systems have seldom been based on their own cultural values. Curricula that reflect ideas and methods imported from other countries have been adopted by government officials. The education given bears no relation to everyday reality, neither in terms of things taught nor in methods used by teachers. This "education" is accomplished in a language which has nothing to do with their daily lives and, in addition, the history, heroes, ideals and values presented have very little meaning to the youths and adults in the isolated rural minority communities (Apazo, 1978; Swift, 1975).

Another study reports that schools fail to take Canadian Indian cultural differences into consideration. Consequently, attendance is low and teachers feel continuous frustration. Almost all communities in the Northland reportedly have a greater or lesser degree of self-containment, have a cultural and social structure which sets them apart from the mainstream of the Alberta society, but educational policies ignore the cultural bases (Swift, 1975).

It is important to note that some of the Brazilian tribes have succeeded in surviving within the Brazilian society. However, with many of the Amazonian Indians who are quite isolated, the scope of contact with outsiders is brief and intrusions upon their cultures have intensified the threat of their extinction (McNeil, 1978).

Cultural standards are as diverse as the minorities themselves, and the uniqueness within the rural minorities' cultures should certainly be considered by the majority in a society when they develop an educational

program for a particular rural minority. Swift (1975), for example, found that the native people do, in fact, communicate non-verbally far more than do people in white society. This being the case, teachers should be trained to recognize such cultural phenomena and make use of them. Stilwell (1976), in his work with rural Puerto Rican minorities, found that peers are much more influential as counselors in vocational educational planning than educational professionals. This cultural difference must be taken into consideration when career and educational programs for rural minorities in Puerto Rico are being developed.

Another difference that Swift found (1975) was that parents have a greater attitude of permissiveness toward their children, less of telling or influencing them as to what the children should do. If a child does not want to go to school, it is essentially his own decision to make. The child does not have to go to school. Of course, a great many minority children play a more important economic role in the home than do most majority children. Because of this cultural difference, many of them stay out of school to help sustain the family, which is culturally acceptable within that group.

An unusual type of cultural difference was found by Spilerman (1974) in Israel, where he investigated the contribution of community to ethnic stratification in developmental towns. Many of the minorities in the small rural settlements were quite different from those normally found in other places in the world. These were immigrants from other countries, many of whom were Europeans who were highly educated or who had specific occupational skills. Minority people of this type soon leave rural areas, moving to urban centers where their occupational skills and education are more in demand. Those persons with less training and education are left in the rural settlements.

Still another type of cultural difference that may play an important role was observed by Trueba (1974). He found that Mexican Indian males are more frequently bilingual than are females. He said, to put it another way, that males are more outcultured into the Mexican national way of life than are females. He went on the say, "In fact, the cultural differences have polarized opposing groups having different values in such matters as religious belief and family structure, marriage regulations, economic organization, eating habits, and dressing patterns."

In Norway, school authorities recognize that it is impossible for harmonic development and effective learning to take place without being connected to the Lap language and culture. Some Laps, however, did not concur. They suspect it as means for the majority population to keep Laps at the lower ends of educational and socioeconomic ladders (Ulfsby).

LANGUAGES

One of the most important differences noted among rural minorities has been that of language. While in most cases the predominant language is spoken by many in rural minorities, the primary language spoken in the home is usually different from the major language of the nation. Swift (1975) reported that large percentages of pupils came to school speaking the mother tongue, some have a rudimentary knowledge of English, and some speak English only. In the latter case, again, the exception must be acknowledged; the quality of English leaves much to be desired. He reports that in almost all, if not all, of the Northland schools, English language deficiency is a factor which retards the students' progress and adds to

the effort required by teachers. The students, in general, have a reluctance to speak, even within their level of competence.

If we stick to the most isolated areas, however, bilingualism is on the increase (Trueba, 1974). Rural schools in the state of Puebla have a long history of intervention by outside authorities to help make the Indians bilingual. In the past decade, there has been a considerable reduction in the number of monolinguals in the Indian language, a decrease in bilinguals in Indian and Spanish, and a corresponding increase in monolingual Spanish. As reported earlier, it is interesting to note that males are more frequently bilingual than females. But there is evidence that one of the problems that rural minorities may be facing as they become more educated is the fact that they will lose their native language and, in many cases, will have only an inferior use of the majority language.

There is not complete agreement in the theory of teaching the child in his own language, and there is not complete agreement among the minority parents that this should be done. Some see it as a means of keeping them on the lower socioeconomic level and of not becoming a part of the majority. Others see it as a means of conserving their culture.

Girard (1972), in his work on the training of native teachers in Quebec, Canada, said that to ask a child to learn a second language at the moment of development when he is starting school would be to limit him in the discovery of his personality and his milieu. It would also retard, if not prevent, him from reaching mastery of verbal expression in his own language.

In northern areas of Norway, Sweden, and Finland, instruction in the Lap language has increased considerably. In addition, Lapish materials are interpreted and integrated into other subjects in the school. It is interesting to note that in Sweden and Finland in the pure Lapish areas, parents want teaching to occur in the majority language and see this as a means to help their children to become more educated. However, in the region where Lapish is endangered, the parents want school teaching to be in Lapish.

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS IN EMPLOYMENT

One of the major characteristics of rural minorities in that they are among the lower strata of the socioeconomic scale of a nation and are in the lower levels of employment. This factor alone may determine their educational attainment more than almost any other factor. Socio-economic level and employment needs must be solved along with educational problems. It is very difficult to determine which comes first, higher educational attainment and then higher socioeconomic levels, or higher socioeconomic levels and then higher educational attainment. Hirschman (1978) found that education of ethnic women will increase both their aspirations and qualifications for employment in the modern sector. He found, also, that attainment improves employment status in other sectors. Women with the least education would most likely be found in the agricultural sector. But, among women who obtain lower secondary schooling, employment in agriculture is very rare. Most women with at least secondary schooling are found to be employed in the modern non-agricultural sector. He found that, clearly, higher education raises aspirations and credentials that

enable them to find modern sector employment that is largely independent of family obligations.

As was also mentioned earlier in the paper, Spilerman (1974) showed that within the isolated rural Jewish settlements in Israel, occupational opportunities for some of the more educated minorities were rare in the rural villages, and many left the rural villages and moved to urban areas as a result.

An increase in the socioeconomic level of an area may not always mean increased income for the minority peer. Stoddard (1975), in his study of the United States-Mexico borderlands, indicated that an overall per capita income increase within the American borderland was no guarantee for less poverty among minority peoples. He further pointed out that border residents are forced to subsidize cheap foreign labor, since their local taxes must provide the social and medical services for the impoverished non-citizens in their midst. Stoddard also warns that just increasing educational opportunities may not totally solve the problems of the rural minorities. Again, educational improvement should be only one component of social and economic improvement. He found that even those minorities with formal education and occupational skills equal to their Anglo counterparts were paid less for doing the same work and that current educational expenditures were used more to assist Anglo education than that of the Mexican Americans, Blacks, or American Indians. He also found that Mexico has perpetuated its caste society of elites and poor, currently continues that socioeconomic inheritance of one's parents in the American borderland, and that poverty is often regulated according to racial and ethnic differences.

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL IN ATTAINMENT

Partially as a result of the factors mentioned previously (poor educational policies, cultural bias, lack of opportunity and background) we find that the educational attainment of the rural minorities is generally the lowest of any group within a particular nation. Most of the research bears this out (Swift, 1975; Apazo, 1978; Trueba, 1974). In most cases, parents want their children to succeed in school and see successful education as a means of getting further ahead (Swift, 1975). But the remedy may also be the source of cultural destruction; it is often educational attainment that eliminates the culture of the rural minority. In most communities where the rural minority reside, there are few adult models whose attainments have a dependence upon schooling. Apart from teachers and sometimes parish priests, there are few such career models. No range of persons occupying a spectrum of choice is available to serve as examples. Not to be aware of such models, other than casually through books and films, must reduce the probability of aspiration. On the other hand, there may well be success models within the culture of the community worthy of emulation from other viewpoints, thereby reinforcing a possible bias against education.

One area for improvement could be curriculum which is often inadequate and not relevant to the needs of the rural minority youth. This does not mean that the curriculum should only perpetuate the culture and values, especially if these people desire to become a part of the mainstream of the majority. It does mean, however, that the curriculum should relate to those things that are common within the communities and use these commonalities as a means of bridging the gap. If desirable to them,

rural minority members may choose their places within the mainstream of a particular nation.

A strength that could be reinforced or supported is that some of the most dedicated, although underpaid and undereducated, teachers are in rural areas; but, they are often neglected by their ministries of education. It is very difficult to reach these teachers and help in meeting their needs.

Trueba (1974) reported that teachers seem to be very idealistic, if not completely impractical. He cites an example of a teacher suggesting that a bath should be taken every day in a village where no one has indoor facilities and where, at 8,000 feet, it may get cold during the night, even during the summer. The same comment can be made about the teachers' talks on nutrition. Advice taken from books would be, for most of these people, totally artificial and impractical. Recommendations to eat meat and drink milk regularly may be completely out of line, as these high-protein animal foods may not be available within the socioeconomic needs of the rural minority.

The programs which are developed at the national level quite often do not take into consideration the needs of the particular people found in the isolated rural areas. There are indications, however, that this is being changed. In a meeting in Brazilia in December, 1979, on educational administration in the Americas, a large section of the meeting was dedicated to rural education and many papers pointed out the problems involved with educating rural minorities. Central governments are beginning to recognize these problems and to develop policies that can help to alleviate the situations.

Hopefully, it is not too little, too late. Central governments should recognize that it will cost more to educate people who are both isolated and of a minority culture; that special means must be used to meet special needs. They should also realize that people should have a voice in the policies and educational decisions that are made on their behalf; and, even though they may have low levels of education, they have high levels of wisdom gained from living in the isolated, often very harsh communities where they are found.

We may find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to have minority rural children become proficient in both their minority language and culture as well as the majority language and culture. A trade-off may be the only practical solution, and for both the parents and the pupils, education in the school may often require making a choice between local and national society. Perhaps few will break through and be able to become a part of both cultures, conversing and communicating in both languages. For the most part, however, it will cause serious confusion and frustrations.

Ruong (1972) reported that for uneducated Laps there are not enough openings or positions so that they can use their knowledge and talents for the good of their own group, and that the educated ones must often leave their minority group in order to use their education.

The prime fact about a member of a cultural minority is that, educationally speaking, he is a member not of one society, but of two. An education program for cultural minorities cannot alone provide a fuller life for these people. Such programs must be part of a total effort to improve life for the whole community and, therefore, they must be

carefully planned to include components of all efforts in areas such as health, rural development, economic development, in addition to educational development (Cairnes, 1972).

Apazo, Julio Tumeri, Ed., "The Indian Liberation and Social Rights Movement in Kallasuyu (Bolivia) - IWGIA Document 30," International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, Copenhagen May 1978
ED 156838

Carins, John; UMESCO on Cross-Cultural Education. Paper presented at the International Conference on Cross Cultural Education and the Circumpolar Nations: Montreal 1969

Darnell, Frank (ed); Education in the North: Selected Papers of the International Conference on Cross Cultural Education and the Circumpolar Nations. Montreal 1972
ED 92272

Girard, Christaine; Training of Native Teachers in Quebec; Paper presented at the International Conference on Cross Cultural Education and the Circumpolar Nations: Montreal 1969

Hirschman, C. and Aghajania, A.; Womens Labor Force Participation and Socio-economic Development; The Case of Peninsular Malaysia 1957-1970; Paper presented at annual meeting of Rural Sociological Society, Aug 1978.
ED 160 206

McNeil, Stephen, "Brazilian Development versus the Amazonia Indians," American Indian Journal, December 1978
EJ 113 032

Nickul Kari; Administrative Situations and the Lap Population: Paper presented at the International Conference on Cross Cultural Education and the Circumpolar Nations: Montreal 1969

Pelletur, Emile; "A Social History of The Manitoba Metis, The Development and Loss of Aboriginal Rights," Manitoba Metis Foundation, 1974.
ED 110 207

Ruong, Israel; Lapp Schools, Teacher Education and Trans Cultural Studies; Paper presented at the International Conference on Cross Cultural Education and the Circumpolar Nations. Montreal 1969

Spillerman, S. and Habih, J.; Development Towns in Israel; The Role of Community in Creating Ethnic Disparities in Labor Force Characteristics; Brookdale Institute of Gerontology and Adult Human Development, Jerusalem (Israel) 1974
ED 101 033

Stilwell, Wm. E. and Carrasquillo, M: Influence of Rural Puerto Rican Counselors on Eleventh Graders, 1978.
ED 138 846

Stoddard, Ellewyn; Real, Regulated and Relative Poverty in the U.S. - Mexico Borderland; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, 1975
ED 113 102

Swift, W.H. and others; Report of the Northland School Division Study Group; Alberta Department of Education, 1975
ED 135 548

Trueba, Enrique Torres, Xalacapan: Village and School in Zac[illegible]oaxtia, Puebla: Paper presented at annual meeting of the Ameri[illegible] Anthropological Association, 1974.
ED 103 142

Ulfsby, Meg Boon; Norweigian Cross-Cultural Programs for Lapp Societies; Paper presented at the International Conference on Cross Cultural Education and the Circumpolar Nations. Montreal 1969

Whitten, Norman E., Ecuadorian Ethnocide and Indigenous Ethnogenesis: Amazonia Resurgence Amidst Andean Colonialism, IWGIA Document no. 23 International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, Copenhagen, 1976.
ED 138 387

CONCLUSION

It is readily evident as we review the available literature on the education of minority youth in rural areas of the similarities in different countries and regions of the world. There are probably greater degrees of similarity of education problems within this group than that of any other. This is true of both developed and developing countries.

Historically the educational objective of the majority government was that of assimilation into the major culture. Based on economics alone, this made sense and was pursued without any consideration of the feelings of the rural minorities themselves. Generally, this has failed with lower levels of educational attainment the results.

The parents of most rural minority youth are well aware of the conflict between educating the youth between the mainstream culture where more educational opportunities and jobs may exist and maintaining the native culture which in itself may limit the economic opportunities for the young people. It is in this area where there needs to be better cooperation between the educators, the majority culture and the minority culture to develop more adequate educational programs to meet both needs.

Governments from around the world are beginning to recognize the need for better educational programs for rural minority youth. This awareness has been brought on primarily for economic reasons than a desire to better serve the minority populations. Being aware alone, however, has not made it possible for them to develop programs to serve their educational needs. It is an important step and a beginning. In the

past, efforts to mainstream the rural minority youth as well as maintain their languages and culture have generally led to failure of both objectives. Thus the youth are not adequately educated to function in either world.

Other similarities include inadequate curriculum, facilities as well as trained and sensitive teachers. Developing educational programs for all rural youth is very expensive and even more so for the rural minorities. This high cost factor coupled with generally lower levels of finances for rural education has led to inadequate programs and poorly educated people.

Hard research data on the education of rural minorities has been extremely difficult to find. The literature is beginning to come up with some writing which are primarily opinions and emotionally generated. As programs develop, it is extremely important that adequate research be a part of the development. Future decisions for the education of rural minorities will then have a much sounder theoretical base.